



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,421	01/30/2002	Herald M. Baldonado	TI-32857	5110

7590

05/29/2003

Mike Skrehot
Texas Instruments Incorporated
M/S 3999
P.O. BOX 655474
Dallas, TX 75265

EXAMINER

CLARK, SHEILA V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/066,421

Applicant(s)

Baldonado et al

Examiner

Sheila V. Clark

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED May 5, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
the application continues to contain many unclear area that are only more confused by applicant's remarks. (see attached page)

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, and 4-22

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

10. ☐ Other: _____

Sheila V. Clark
SHEILA V. CLARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2815

Art Unit: 2815

For example applicant continues to attempt to read more into what is shown and disclosed than what is actually supported. Applicant comments on page 3, first paragraph whereby applicant relays that , "since only one ball 23 appears on pad 21 it follows that wire 20 is attached by a stitch bond". The disclosures on page 4 line only states that "the other end of wire 20 is attached to interposer pad 21". It therefore fails to follow that said wire is stitch bonded when it is not disclosed. Further applicant appears to assume that the only method of bonding a lead to a pad is by stitch bonding.

Further confusing is that the applicant refers to a "stitch bond 25" on page 3 of the remarks and the disclosure refers to 25 as both a stitch and a lead (see page 4, line 8 and line 19). Further applicant submits that an electro-less substrate means an "insulating" substrate. Electro-less however is well known in the art as a "plating process" and therefore would be used to describe a metallized substrate.

Page 4 of the applicant's remarks state that is well known in the art to form solder balls on pads and because it is well known then solder balls may then be attached to leads 15, 25 and 65. Well many features in semiconductor technology are well known in the art but said features must still be clearly supported in the disclosure to claims before one can claim these well known in the art features as part of ones invention.

With regard to the drawings, though it was indicated in a previous office action that the drawings and disclosure fail to support certain features and that the claimed invention should be shown in the drawings the features that the applicant attempts to show in the drawings are not

Art Unit: 2815

fully supported in the disclosure. Also, applicant submitted said drawings in the previous office action without any form of explanation relative to what he attempted to show. It is unclear if 25 shows a stitch or lead and if the substrate shown is a substrate or an interposer that supports the interposer pads. It was also unclear where the floating pad was formed. There is also no structural discussion in the disclosure relative to a ball grid array to lead one to the structure shown in the amended drawings.

Many features of this application continue to lack clarity and therefore are grossly deficient in its clarity of disclosure. Further, the features of the instant invention are deemed to be clearly taught by Schmidt et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner S.V. Clark whose telephone number is (703) 308-4924.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee, can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722 or 7724. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

May 26, 2003



SHEILA V. CLARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER